ABSOLUTION FOR DR. CARTER.

ASKED TO CONTINUE HIS "HONORED CONNECTION."

In an Address at Meeting of Nassau Presbytery Dr. Carter Declares That the "Hard, Cold Severe God of the Westminster Confession Is Not Our God."

Notwithstanding his formal renunciation of faith in the doctrines of the Westminster Confession, the Nassau Presbytery, at its regular meeting in Jamaica, L. I., yesterday, voted without a dissenting voice to retain the Rev. Samuel T. Carter of this city in its membership. Dr. Carter was present and in a set speech of much power again denounced the Westminster Confession doctrines. Yet he was retained amid decided evidences of enthusiasm.

But the Presbytery did not stop there. Again, by unanimous vote, it passed a resolution, drawn by the Rev. Dr. Carter and introduced by the Rev. Dr. J. Howard Hobbs, recommending—"overturing" is the form of expression—the General Assembly to formally adopt the "Brief Statement," or revised creed, as the creed of the Presbyterian Church. This was another decided victory for the Rev. Dr. Carter.

This, to all appearances, brings to an end a controversy which, for the last three months, has greatly agitated the Presbyterians of Long Island and has attracted general interest elsewhere.

At the October meeting of the Nassau Presbytery in Oyster Bay it was the subject of a discussion which at times developed strong tendencies toward heat, and which lasted an entire day. The Rev. Dr. Kneeland P. Ketcham of Freeport denounced Dr. Carter as "a rationalistic Unitarian." Dr. Ketcham also introduced a resolution to expunge Dr. Carter's name from the rolls of the Nassau Presbytery, of which he had been a member more than thirty years.

Still another clergyman denounced Dr. Carter as "unfair" to the Presbytery in proclaiming such views as he had proclaimed in his formal letter sent out to all the members of the Presbytery, renouncing his faith in the Westminster doctrines.

A lay member made an attempt to dodge the issue on the quibble that Dr. Carter's letter—although printed copies of it had been sent to every member of the Presbytery—was not technically a communication to the Presbytery and might, therefore, be ignored.

All of these efforts to meet the question or to dodge it were beaten down by Dr. Carter's supporters in the Presbytery. Finally, after an all day discussion, during which the contending parties had revolved around each other, like two men holding opposite ends of a stick, without getting any nearer together, it was voted to "sidestep" the issue—as world ngs might express it—by shouldering it off on a committee.

The committee waited on Dr. Carter to get a clearer expression of his views. Several members of the Presbytery said they did not see how Dr. Carter's views could be made any clearer than they were made by the very vigorous and clean cut English of his letter. The committee consisted of the Rev. Dr. Kneeland P. Ketcham, the Rev. Dr. J. Howard Hobbs, the Rev. Dr. A. G. Russell, the Rev. Dr. Lyman D. Calkins, the Rev. J. Carl Schmuck, Amor Denton, John B. Pratt and J. S. Cooley.

The committee saw Dr. Carter at his home in this city last month. There was a heart to heart talk, and Dr. Carter repeated verbally the same things about the Westminster Confession that he had said six weeks before in writing. The committee then drew up a report, which was submitted to the Nassau Presbytery at its meeting in Jamaica yesterday, and it was the unanimous adoption of this report which retained Dr. Carter in full membership of the Presbytery.

The report of the committee follows:

Whereas your committee, after most careful consideration of the letter sent to the Nassau Presbytery by our copresbyter, the Rev. S. T. Carter, D. D., as well as protracted conference with the brother, has reached a clearer mutual apprehension of the real purport and purposes, and,

Whereas it contains certain views to which our Presbytery can give no sanction, express or implied, but understands it in the main to be his personal protest against the further recognition by our Church of certain dogmas long since repudiated by the evangelical church and further disavowed by our General Assembly of 1902, by its enthusiastic adoption of the Brief Statement of the Reformed Faith for a Better Understanding of our Doctrinal Beliefs," and,

Whereas our brother, despite the apparent incongruities of his letter, has affirmed in most emphatic and unqualified terms his ardent allegiance to this Brief Statement as the real and only practical working creed of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; and

Whereas your committee cannot feel that any other less than this should be applied to any minister for good and regular standing in our body; we therefore

Recommend that, with the consent of Dr. Carter, the aforesaid letter be laid upon the table in favor of the revised Presbyterian emphasis of the Brief Statement as the representative creed of the Presbyterian Church, and that this Presbytery request our brother to continue his honored connection with the Presbyterian commission, believing that his presence will be for our mutual benefit.

Before the motion on the adoption of this report was put yesterday Dr. Ketcham asked Dr. Carter if he consented, under the terms of the report, to withdraw his letter. Dr. Carter replied that it was not for him to consent or to refuse to consent; it was for the Presbytery to act.

The Rev. Dr. Hobbs called Dr. Ketcham's attention to the fact that there was nothing whatever in the report about Dr. Carter withdrawing his letter. The report merely recommended laying the letter on the table and continuing Dr. Carter in the Presbytery. Then the motion was put and carried unanimously.

It was not until after Dr. Carter, in an address lasting nearly an hour, had denounced the Westminster dogmas that he was voted to be still a member of the Presbytery. Among other things, he said:

Unfortunately the [revision] committee's work, the Brief Statement, was limited by the general proviso that it was received to give information and a better understanding of our doctrinal beliefs, and not with a view to its becoming a substitute for or an affirmation of our Confession of Faith. This leaves the Westminster Confession still the creed of the Presbyterian faith. Every minister and every elder, upon entering his office, must still accept the Westminster Confession as being the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures, and every scoffer can still cast up this system against the Presbyterian Church.

I am convinced there can be no rest or peace until this system is as fully abandoned by the Church as it is by the Brief Statement. I should like much, if Calvin were living today, to hear his recommendation upon his Institutions. I think he might make the general remark: "Burn them; let us write another." If Calvin were living to-day he would be chairman of the revision committee. He would bring down his fist upon this system of ours, and there would be nothing left of it but splinters.

I had all these years borne the heavy burden of this creed and its system. It grew heavier every year. I felt that I must in the most open and earnest way declare my rejection of it. I gave up my pastoral work that I might not involve my congregation in the responsibility of this declaration, and planned this work of rejection to be the closing work of my life.

I have been filled with amazement at the condemnation that has come upon me from certain quarters for sending my letter to the Presbytery. This condemnation appears to me like moral obliquity. Is it not a chief duty of every man, and especially of every minister, to be entirely frank and candid in his teachings, and, if he has serious doubts, or if he diverges from the system taught in the Church, is it not an imperative duty to consult his brethren and put himself in their hands as I have done?

I challenge absolutely the complaint that has been made against me. I am ready to take the suffrages of all true men upon that point, and especially of honorable laymen. I seem to myself to have done a service to my Church. I have gone into the darkest room of the Presbyterian domicile, and into the darkest closet of that room, and the darkest corner of the closet, and opened the secret drawers and thrown off the wrappings, and brought out into God's beautiful sunlight the system that is adopted—and not believed—and said: "See your system!" The conservatives at such a time have a sort of fit, and cry tremblingly: "Hush! Hush! Take it back and go away! Do go away yourself!"

I am willing to receive all the severe judgment and ostracism that may come from many quarters and to stand out again in the open sunshine, and, holding this thing up, say: "In God's and in Christ's name, it is not true!" There is no such God as the God of the Confession. There is no such world as the world of the Confession. There is no such eternity as the eternity of the Confession. It is all rash, exaggerated and bitterly untrue.

There is something deeply pathetic in the sad, patient look of the common people, the plain people, who fear that these dreadful things may be true because their leaders have never said that they were false. If no one else is ready to say it, I say it. The hard, cold, severe God of the Confession, with the love left out, is not our God.

There is no such God as the God of the Westminster Confession. This world so full of flowers and sunshine and the laughter of children is not a cursed, lost world, and the "endless torment" of the Confession is not God's, nor Christ's, nor the Bible's idea of a future punishment.

We have sent out an evangelistic committee to stir the Church. Let them begin here by getting the right God. If this God is the God of the Westminster Confession, they will never convince or convert true or thoughtful men, and all their music, meetings, collections, will be empty wind.

AGAINST HIGHER CRITICISM.

Any Judge Living Would Throw Out the Critics' Case, Says the Rev. F. D. Storey.

The Rev. F. D. Storey, who is an expert on common law and does not believe in Higher Criticism, talked to the Baptist Ministers' Conference yesterday on "Higher Criticism and the Question of Evidence." He said that if a case were brought into a civil court and judgment were asked for on evidence of the same relative importance as the critics advance to support their contentions, there is no civil court Judge living who would not at once throw out the case.

VOTE TO IMPEACH SWAYNE.

House Likely to Follow Judiciary Committee's Recommendation.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—A minority of eight members of the House Committee on the Judiciary, composed of Chairman Jenkins and Messrs. Parker, Alexander, Littlefield, Thomas, Gillet, Pearre and Warner, today joined with the majority in recommending the impeachment of Judge Charles Swayne of Florida. The minority arrived at the conclusion that the Judge should be impeached because he falsified his expense account.

After the views of the minority had been presented a number of leaders had a consultation in the Ways and Means Committee room and came to the conclusion that the House would probably not debate the resolution for more than a day, and that therefore it would be courteous to the leaders of the Senate to notify them that they had better prepare for the trial of the Judge.

Aldrich, Allison and other older Senators intimated that it would please them if the House would not present the impeachment before they had had an opportunity to look up the precedents and get together the materials for making up the code of rules under which the trial will proceed.

The leaders of the House will, therefore, allow as much time, within reason, for debate as the friends of Judge Swayne desire. Chairman Jenkins of the Judiciary Committee is himself in doubt as to when notice will be served on the Senate that articles of impeachment would be presented.

The impression among the members of the Judiciary Committee is that no notice will be served on the Senate until the House has adopted articles of impeachment. The assumption in all the discussions was that the House would adopt the resolution of impeachment without a doubt. When it does adopt it, if ever, the Judiciary Committee will have to prepare the articles of impeachment. These will cause more debate than the resolution that the Judge be impeached.

The minority of the committee believes the falsification of the expense accounts should be the sole ground for impeachment, while the majority, led by Representative Palmer, chairman of the sub committee which heard the testimony, believes the articles should contain charges based on the so-called abuse of judicial powers, the use of the property of the bankrupt railroad as well as that of making false returns of his expense account and collecting money thereon.

Falsification of accounts is an indictable offence, the statutes providing as punishment imprisonment for not less nor more than five years, or a fine of not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000. A finding of guilty by the Senate would not free the Judge from liability to punishment under the provisions of that statute, the penalty under impeachment proceedings extending no farther than removal from and disqualification for holding office.

RAILROADS FOR PHILIPPINES.

Newlands Suggests in Senate That Government Build and Operate Them.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—When the Philippines bill was called up in the Senate this afternoon, Mr. Spooner (Rep., Wis.) brought forward the matter of the possible insolvency of railroad companies whose bonds the Government was to guarantee. Mr. Spooner said that while he did not oppose the bill, he believed that safeguards to protect the Government should be provided in the measure. This brought from Mr. Bacon (Dem., Ga.), the remark that he knew of no instance where railroads which had received Government aid had not gone into insolvency.

Mr. Spooner concurred in Mr. Bacon's statement as far as railroads receiving national aid were concerned, but said he was not familiar enough with the history of such cases to make a more general statement.

Mr. Newlands (Dem., Nev.) made quite an extended speech in which he cited figures to show that it would be preferable, and a good investment, for the Philippines Government to build railroads and operate them. As the road was essential to the prosperity of the Philippines, the Government should build it.

Mr. Newlands said that as a general rule he did not favor government ownership, but as between existing evils in railroad management and the threatened evils of government control he preferred the latter. He favored more effective regulation of railroads, and declared that the present unparalelled concentration of wealth was in great measure due to special privileges and rebates granted by railroads.

In the course of his remarks Mr. Newlands quoted from William J. Bryan and President Roosevelt on the policies of the Democratic and Republican parties with reference to the Philippines.

Mr. Foraker asked Mr. Newlands why he ignored Judge Parker.

Mr. Newlands replied that he did not ignore the views of any Democrats, but that he referred to Mr. Bryan because for the last eight years he had been the recognized leader of the Democracy.

VARDAMAN IS INVITED.

Gets Same Invitation as Every Other Governor to the Inauguration.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—A formal announcement was sent to Gov. Vardaman of Mississippi to-day that Theodore Roosevelt will be inaugurated on March 4 and inviting him to attend at the head of as many of his troops as he cares to bring. He was also asked how many Mississippi troops he would bring with him. Similar announcements and invitations were sent to all other Governors.

Whatever talk there may have been among the members of the inaugural committee about not inviting Gov. Vardaman on account of his attacks on the President, it was nothing more than talk. Mr. Vardaman is a Governor, and the committee could not take cognizance of the fact that he has maligned Mr. Roosevelt.

ELKINS FOR COMMERCE COURT

BELIEVES IN ENGLISH PLAN OF FIXING RAILROAD RATES.

Will Suggest It to the Senate Committee, but Isn't Very Hopeful of Legislation at This Session—Cullom Sees the President About His Recommendation.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—Although it is generally accepted as conclusive in both branches of Congress that there will be no action during this session intended to fulfil the recommendations of the President for increased powers for the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, of which Mr. Elkins of West Virginia is chairman, is to begin consideration of the subject on Friday in order that the opnion of the committee may be obtained and a general canvass of the situation made.

Mr. Elkins, who is a practical railroad man, will offer to the committee on Friday what he considers a solution of the situation, but he is not inclined to be encouraged over the outlook for legislation this winter. He will discuss the matter with the President before the commitee meets. His proposition was thus described by him to-day:

"My proposition involves the creation of an interstate commerce court to be composed of nine members—one for and from each judicial circuit of the United States. After a study of this question covering a period of six or more years, I am convinced that the powers contemplated in effecting the regulation of railroad rates should be lodged in a duly formed tribunal and not in a simple commission. This tribunal should be composed of men of practical experience and learning in railroad affairs in whom the people and the railroad corporations have confidence. I would arrange it so that this court should decide not only the rates of railroads, but those of steamship lines doing business in American ports as well.

"I would have each member of the Interstate Commerce Court appointed to office for life and allowed a liberal salary. In fact, I would make provision to place the court on a par in point of dignity and general judicial standing with the Supreme Court of the United States.

"This whole question involves the most important problem now confronting the American people, in my opinion. When we stop to realize that the matter of five thousand millions of property is involved, we can best appreciate its magnitude. The English Government was in a quandary for some years as to how best to deal with the situation. Finally it resolved to create just such a court as I have indicated. Its workings have been of the most satisfactory character in England, and no doubt would be in the United States.

"I shall offer my proposition to members of the committee on Friday and hope to evoke a general discussion of its merits. I hope to see its adoption finally."

Senator Cullom of Illinois, who has been for many years a member of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and was formerly its chairman, called on the President this morning and had a talk with him about legislative matters. After coming from the White House Senator Cullom said that there was, in his opinion, little prospect of Congress passing an act at this session to enlarge the powers of the commission, as recommended in the President's message. A measure empowering the commission to fix rates might possibly pass the House, he said, but it would not go through the Senate.

Mr. Cullom said that he was himself the author of a bill to enlarge the powers of the commission, but he had not even been permitted to report the measure from the Interstate Commerce Committee when he was its chairman.

Another bill enlarging the powers of the Commission was introduced in the House to-day by Representative Steenerson of Minnesota. In a general way it follows the lines of the Cooper-Quarles bill, the measure which brought the question of railway rate regulation to the front.

It differs from it in the fact that the courts are to have power when called upon to review a rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, to modify the order of commission, revise it or in fact do anything it sees fit. When a rate is so changed, it is to stand as the order of the commission.

The courts have held that all they can do is to decide whether a rate is reasonable or unreasonable. Heretofore, if they held a rate of 20 cents was unreasonable they could not say that the addition of one cent would make it reasonable. This, they held, was a legislative power, but one which Congress could delegate.

As in the Cooper-Quarles measure, the Steenerson bill provides that the commission is to entain control over a rate through complaint of a shipper that it is unreasonable or discriminative. It also provides that when such a complaint is made the carrier against which it is made shall make answer in writing.

If it fails to answer within thirty days, the commission is empowered to proceed, fix a rate and enforce it, and continue to enforce it until it is changed, upon appeal by the courts.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is to have power under the bill to send for persons and papers, administer oaths and punish for contempt.

DUTCH DIPLOMAT'S LOSS.

Two of Minister Swinderin's Wedding Presents Mysteriously Disappear.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—Jonkeer R. De Marees Van Swinderin, Minister from the Netherlands, who is to marry Miss Elizabeth Glover of Washington on Dec. 21, asked Police Headquarters to-day to clear up a mystery surrounding the disappearance of two valuable English engravings.

The pictures, which were wedding presents, were shipped by express to Washington from Lenox, Mass., on Oct. 25, arriving here Oct. 31. The box was delivered to the apartments of the Minister in the Albany Hotel.

Next day the box was removed to the present Legation of the Netherlands. The box was opened to-day and was empty. There were no marks on it to indicate that it had been tampered with.

Miss Glover is the daughter of Charles C. Glover, president of the Riggs National Bank.

PRESIDENT FILLS OFFICES.

Ira Harris Steamboat Inspector—Neill Labor Commissioner.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—The President sent to the Senate to-day the following nominations:

To be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture—Willet M. Hayes of Minnesota.

To be Commissioner of Labor—Charles P. Neill of the District of Columbia.

To be Supervising Inspector of Steam Vessels for the Second Steamboat Inspection District:—Ira Harris of New Jersey.

To be Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of San Juan, Porto Rico—Graham L. Rice of Wisconsin.

WESTERN UNION TURNED DOWN

SUPREME COURT DECIDES IN FAVOR OF THE PENNA. R. R.

The Telegraph Company, It Holds, Has No Right of Eminent Domain—Poles Justly Removed by the Railroad—Act Passed in 1866 Invoked in Vain.

WASHINGTON, Dec 12.—The Supreme Court to-day decided that the Western Union Telegraph Company possessed no such right of eminent domain, as it claimed, as would prevent the Pennsylvania Railroad from removing the poles of the telegraph company from its lines at the termination of the contract between the two corporations.

In 1902, shortly before the expiration of their contract, the required notice of its termination was served on the Western Union by the railroad company, together with a declination to renew it and notice to remove the poles.

The telegraph company obtained from the Federal court in New Jersey an injunction to prevent the removal of its poles in that State. In some other States similar injunctions were obtained and in still others the poles were cut down. The Pennsylvania, however, proceeded to carry out its new contract with the Postal Telegraph company, permitting it to place poles and string wires along the railroad, and the telegraph offices in the railroad stations were turned over to the Postal company.

In addition to the suit for injunction, the Western Union also filed in the Federal Court in New Jersey a suit for condemnation by the court of a right of way along the Pennsylvania road and asking the court to fix the amount of compensation thereof.

The company based this suit upon the right of eminent domain conferred by the law of 1866, which gave it "the right to construct, maintain and operate lines of telegraph through and over any portion of the public domain of the United States, over and along any of the military or post roads of the United States which have been or may be hereafter declared such by act of Congress, and over, under or across the navigable streams or waters of the United States," provided that it filed written acceptance of the restrictions and obligations required by the act. This acceptance was filed in 1867.

In other words, the company claimed the right to enter and appropriate for its poles and lines a part of the right of way of any railroad which was a post road upon paying just compensation therefor.

The main question, therefore, said Justice McKenna, in delivering the opinion of the court, was the construction of the act of 1866. But it had already been settled by this court more than twenty-five years ago in the case of the Pensacola Telegraph Company vs. the Western Union Telegraph Company, and later in the Ann Arbor Railroad case. In both cases the court had decided adversely to the rights now claimed by the telegraph company.

Quoting from the Pensacola case the opinion, Justice McKenna said it had held that the fundamental idea and sole purpose of the statute of 1866 was in effect a prohibition of all State monopolies in commercial intercourse by telegraph. It gave no foreign corporation the right to enter upon private property without the consent of the owner to the erection of poles, but it did provide that whenever the consent of the owner was obtained, no State legislation should prevent the occupation of post roads for telegraph purposes by such corporations as were willing to avail themselves of its privileges.

The use of public property was granted. If private property were required, it must, in so far as the present litigation was concerned, be obtained by private arrangement with its owner. No compulsory proceedings were authorized. State sovereignty under the Constitution was not interfered with. Only national privileges were granted.

The Ann Arbor case merely confirmed the Pensacola case and others. Whatever rights were granted by the act of 1866 were granted to all telegraph companies, and should not be defeated by a binding contract with some one company. The court, said Justice McKenna, was confronted with the serious nature of the right of eminent domain.

The opinion quotes several decisions on questions affecting the exercise of the right of eminent domain by the Government in acquiring sites for its public buildings as showing that the right of condemnation and for compensation was expressly given by Congress in those specific instances. But the act of 1866 contained not one word in regard to the condemnation or compensation.

To the contention of the telegraph company that the charters under which the railway companies constituting the Pennsylvania system were organized expressly created them "public highways," that in the acquisition of land for their purposes they were public agents, and that the roads had become highways in the full sense of the word, subject as ordinary highways and streets were, to the control of Congress for interstate commerce, the opinion says this is an extreme position, to which the court could not go.

"The right of way of a railroad," it continues, "is properly devoted to a public use and has often been called a highway and as such is subject to a certain extent to State and Federal control. But it has always been recognized that a railroad right of way is so far private property as to be entitled to that provision of the Constitution, which forbids its taking, excepting under the power of eminent domain and upon payment of compensation."

Justice Harlan dissented. It was the intent of the act of 1866, he thought, to protect the public against monopolies in telegraphic communication by throwing open all the post roads of the country to the use of telegraph companies accepting its provisions. That opinion was in line with the doctrine often announced by the Supreme Court that a "railroad is a public highway, established primarily for the convenience of the people and to subserve public ends, and therefore subject to Governmental control."

As to the conclusion reached by the majority that the telegraph company did not possess the right of eminent domain under the act in question, because there was no provision for condemnation or compensation, Justice Harlan said that omission was not essential. The ordinary process of law would suffice in the absence of specific directions as to the manner of acquiring the right of way.

Referring to the decision in the Pensacola case, he thought it a mistake to say that the court declared the sole purpose of the act of 1866 was to prevent State monopoly in telegraphs, for the context of the decision showed that the court did not include railroad property employed in commerce when it used the words "private property without the consent of the owner." Post roads were by that decision placed, so far as that act was concerned, on the same plane as public domain.

Justice Brewer, in a concurring opinion, said he based his view solely upon the proposition that the question was settled by the decisions in the Pensacola and other cases.

Had it been tried anew without the previous decisions, he might say there was much force in the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan. As, however, Congress had had twenty-seven years in which to rectify the court's construction of the act of 1866, if it were wrong, and had not done so, he was content to abide by the decision in the Pensacola case.

A similar suit brought by the telegraph company in the western district of Pennsylvania against the same road was also decided in favor of the latter on like grounds

SECRETARY MORTON TO STAY.

Probably Will Keep Navy Portfolio for the Next Four Years.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—It is said that at the request of the President Secretary of the Navy Morton has consented to remain in the Cabinet for the period of Mr. Roosevelt's second term. Mr. Morton, according to the previous understanding, desired to surrender the navy portfolio next fall.

Mr. Morton declined to make any statement on the subject to-night, saying that the information would have to be obtained at the White House.

HOUSE DEBATE ON CURRENCY.

HILL'S BILL TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS DISCUSSED.

It Provides for More Notes of Small Denominations and the Recoinage of the Silver Dollars in the Treasury—Williams Wants Banks to Pay Interest

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—The financial and currency question engaged the attention of the House for part of to-day's session in the consideration of the bill offered by Mr. Hill (Rep., Conn.), to "improve currency conditions." Its object, Mr. Hill said, was twofold, to increase the volume of notes of small denominations and to direct the recoinage of silver dollars in the Treasury into subsidiary coins.

He quoted from an opinion by Attorney-General Knox that the power of the Secretary of the Treasury under the act of March 3, 1902, to purchase bullion for subsidiary silver coins was without limitation, express or implied, and he expressed a fear of a revival of the danger from the free coinage of silver. After speeches by Messrs. Hill and Williams (Dem., Miss.), the bill went over as the unfinished business on the calendar.

The bill authorizes the deposit of customs receipts in national bank depositories, the same as other public moneys, removes the limitation of $3,000,000 a month for the withdrawal of circulating notes, authorizes the receipt of gold deposits of not less than $10 and the issue of gold certificates therefor in denominations of not less than $10 and repeats the provision that not more than one-third of the circulating notes of any national bank shall be issued or reissued of the denomination of $5.

Mr. Hill read a letter from Secretary Shaw giving it his approval, with one exception, that the $3,000,000 monthly retirement of notes remain, and Mr. Hill stated that he would move to amend by retaining the limit, with power to the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to increase the limit from time to time.

Mr. Hill announced that he would move another amendment making the circulating note tax on bonds uniform, save on the 3 and 4 per cent. bonds. This, he said, would make the proposed isthmian canal bonds available as a basis for circulation without further legislation.

The section authorizing the recoinage into subsidiary coinage of the five hundred odd millions of silver dollars lying idle in the Treasury, and representing a loss stated by Mr. Hill to be $320,000,000 to the Government, had been stricken out by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr Hill said he proposed to move its reinsertion, believing it to be the most important proposition it contained.

Mr. Williams, the minority leader, said that there were a number of gentlemen with views on economies who had schemes to increase the currency, which, singularly enough, always took the practical turn of bettering the national bank business, now the most prosperous in the country. Their argument was to the effect that the gold standard was in danger, that it was toppling on its foundation and threatening to fall. And to that, to the best of their ability, they added the favorite argument on the silver question, doubtless believing that because they had won on that question at the polls they could carry anything with it in this forum.

His main objection to the bill lay in the proposition to add customs receipts to the moneys which the Secretary of the Treasury may lend to national banks, which was done without interest. It was a universal practice, and, as a fundamental principle, a governmental [illegible] of the Government

was to lend its money at all it should as an individual and the States did, require the regular rate of interest paid on deposit.

Regarding some statements made by Mr. Hill last session, the latter asked if he had not convinced Mr. Williams of their truth after two months' argument.

Mr. Williams—Well, the gentleman, by his persistence, which is his next most characteristic trait to his logicality, did induce me to stop arguing with him. [Laughter.]

Speaker Cannon announced the following committee appointments:

Needham (Rep., Cal.), Ways and Means.
Wood (Rep., N. J.), Coinage, Weights and Measures.
Knowland (Rep., Cal.), Coinage, Weights and Measures.
Webber (Rep., Ohio), Insular Affairs.
Heflin (Dem., Ala.), Mines and Mining.
Thomas (Rep., Ohio), Militia, and Education.
Croft (Dem., S. C.), Manufactures and Expenditures in the Navy Department.

Before taking up this matter the House passed 148 private pension bills, and a number of minor measures imposing no expense upon the Treasury. Chief among these was a bill transferring from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture the management and control of forest reserves, with an amendment authorizing the exportation of wood pulp from Alaska.

FEDERAL EYE ON INSURANCE.

Bill Introduced in House to Carry Out the President's Suggestion.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 12.—A bill which undertakes to carry out President Roosevelt's suggestion for the subjection of the insurance business of the country to Federal supervision was introduced today by Representative Morrell of Pennsylvania.

The bill defines the business of insurance and specifies the different branches of it. It provides for the appointment of a superintendent of insurance to make and enforce all necessary and proper rules for the regulation of the business of insurance in all its branches whenever such business involves interstate or foreign transactions. Whenever a penalty is necessary for the enforcement of a rule, it is to be prescribed only by Congress.

The bill requires all persons, firms or corporations, foreign or domestic, to file annual reports of their business, and that all such persons or concerns as may be engaged in interstate or foreign business shall also file a duly authenticated certificate of their right to carry on the business in the State or country of their domicile.

PUBLICATIONS.

State Fails Again to Convict ex-Mayor Ames.

ST. PAUL, Minn., Dec. 12.—In the fifth trial of ex-Mayor Ames of Minneapolis on the indictment for receiving bribes, the jury disagreed to-day. All cases against him will probably be dropped.